11. ON THE IDENTITY OF RAT-TAILED ANCHOVY COILIA NEGLECTA WHITEHEAD, 1967

Whitehead (1967b) described a new species of rat-tailed anchovy, Coilia neglecta from the collections of the International Indian Ocean Expedition made during 1963-64, on the basis of one holotype and 10 paratypes. In these eleven specimens the number of post-pelvic scutes is 8-9; however, in his key to ten species of Coilia (p. 30) he states that in C. neglecta the number of post-pelvic scutes is 9-11. In the same key he indicates that the number of post-pelvic scutes in C. dussumieri Val. 1848, is 6-8. In the two specimens of C. dussumieri described by him earlier (RMNH 7073, Whitehead et al. 1966; MNHN 3749, Whitehead 1967a), the number of post-pelvic scutes is 8. In the 30 specimens of C. dussumieri from Gollapalem (Krishna District, Andhra Pradesh), all of which had pearly spots in fresh condition, the number of postpelvic scutes is 7-9. According to Whitehead's Key, C. dussumieri is distinguished from the other 9 species in possessing pearly spots on flanks. Haneda (1961) identified them as light organs and according to him '- if this material is preserved in formalin for several months, the golden orange colour of the luminous organ fades away completely, and it becomes almost impossible to recognise the luminous organ on opercular or body surface' (p. 49-50).

Characters usually employed in distinguishing the species of Coilia are: (a) number of ventral rays, (b) length of maxilla, (c) presence or absence of pre-pelvic scutes, (d) number of pectoral filaments, (e) number of abdominal scutes, and (f) gill rakers. A comparison of the characters of C. neglecta Whitehead and C. dussumieri Val., shows considerable or complete overlap in all biometric characters (Tables I and II); the only positive difference between them is with regard to the pearly spots, which are absent in C. neglecta. Examination of C. dussumieri collected from Gollapalem shows that the pearly spots which are very distinct in fresh specimens disappear partially or completely, after preservation in formalin, as observed by Haneda. Since the description of C. neglecta was based on preserved material, and as stated earlier, the light organs in C. dussumieri may disappear after preservation in formalin, C. dussumieri could possibly be mistaken for C. neglecta, while working on preserved material.

A pseudobranch is present both in C. neglecta (Whitehead 1967b) and in the specimen of C. dussumieri in RMNH (No. 7073), but it was not found in the lectotype of C. dussumieri (Whitehead 1967a).

In the circumstances, it is suggested that the validity of *C. neglecta* remains doubtful until some stable characters are found to distinguish it from *C. dussumieri*, because formalin-preserved specimens of

TABLE 1

Character	C. neglecta Whitehead ¹	Lectotype, (MNHN 3749) of C. dussumieri Val. ²	Lectotype (RMNH 7073) of Leptonurus chrysostigma Blkr. (= C. dussumieri)³	C. dussumieri Val. (Gollapalem, n = 30)	
light organs on flanks pseudobranch branchiostegals dorsal rays pectoral rays ventral rays anal rays gill rakers	Absent present 10-12 11 iii 10-11 vi + 10-12 i 6 iii 91-107 17-19 + 23-26 5-6 + 8-9	Present not found 10 1 iii 12 vi + 10 i 6 ii 100 (? 1 or 2 rays missing) 17 + 124 5 + 8	Present minute 8 (?9) 1 iii 12 vi + 13 i 6 iii 103 - + 26 5 + 8	Present small (9-11 fil) 9-11 1 iii 10-11 v-vi + 8-11 i 6 100-112 17-21 + 24-26 5-6 + 7-9	MISCELLANEOUS N

Whitehead 1967a.

² Whitehead 1967b.

3 Whitehead et al. 1966.

4 Whitehead (1967a, p. 154) gives the number of lower gill rakers in the lectotype of C. dussumieri as 12, this is possibly a printer's devil, because the number of lower gill rakers in this species is much higher.

MNHN: Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris. RMNH: Riksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden.

TABLE 2

¹ Whitehead 1967a.

RMNH: Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden.

² Whitehead 1967b.

³ Whitehead et al. 1966. MNHN: Muséum National d' Histoire Naturelle, Paris.

C. dussumieri in which the pearly spots have become indistinct or have disappeared could be easily mistaken for C. neglecta.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The junior author is thankful to Mr. S. Rama Rao, M.Sc., Head of the Department of Zoology, D.N.R. College, Bhimavaram, for the facilities provided and to the University Grants Commission for financial assistance.

ZOOLOGY DEPARTMENT, A.U. POST-GRADUATE CENTRE, GUNTUR-5, A.P., June 29, 1971.

S. DUTT B. V. SESHAGIRI RAO1

REFERENCES

HANEDA, Y. (1961): A preliminary report on two luminous fish from Bombay

and Hong Kong. Sci. Rept. Yokosuka City Mus. 6: 45-50.
WHITEHEAD, P. J. P. (1967a): The clupeoid fishes described by Lacepede, Cuvier & Valenciennes, ibid. Suppl. 2: 148-155.

WHITEHEAD, P. J. P. (1967b): Indian Ocean Anchovies Collected by the Anton

Pacific elopoid and clupeoid fishes. Zool. Verhandel. Leiden 84: 135-145.

12. SOME SOIL ARTHROPODS COLLECTED FROM PADDY FIELDS AT VARANASI

Very little is known about the mesofauna of Indian soil. The present paper is the result of a quantitative investigation of the mesofauna collected from the paddy fields under drought conditions during September to November, 1966. Soil moisture, soil temperature, and percentage of organic matter was also recorded during the period of investigation.

The sampling plots were located on the Agriculture farm of the Faculty of Agriculture, Banaras Hindu University. Two plots of the size 12 × 12 m were selected and total of 32 soil samples (16 from each plot) were taken during the period of study up to the depth of 22.5 cm at randomized cores with a sampling unit $7.5 \times 10 \times 22.5$ cm in size. Soil was carried to the laboratory in polythene bags. All the soil samples were processed in the Ladell Apparatus (Ladell 1936) by flotation method. The fauna collected and stored in glycerated 70% alcohol, were examined by using a binocular microscope. Oudman's fluid, Diaphane, DPX and Canada balsam were employed as mountant, Lacto-

¹ Present Address: Department of Zoology, D.N.R. College, Bhimavaram A.P.).